DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 723 AL 002 351

AUTHOR Gilbert, Glenn G.
TITLE Linguistic Change in the Colonial and Immigrant Languages in the United States.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 70
NOTE 18p.; Revised edition of paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Francisco, December 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS Bilingualism, Deep Structure, *Diachronic Linguistics, *Dialect Studies, Immigrants, *Linguistic Theory, Phonology, Regional Dialects, Social Dialects, Sociolinguistics, Syntax, Transformation Generative Grammar
IDENTIFIERS *Linguistic Geography

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with three problems encountered in the areal study of "colonial" and "immigrant" languages (used in Haugen's sense) and examines how data presented in tabular or map form can assist in their solution. They are: (1) the mechanisms by which the speakers of various dialects of a single language--dialects which were often mutually unintelligible in Europe--make themselves understood in the new situation; (2) the compilation of glossaries recording the lexical "adjustments" brought about by a socio-physical environment ranging from somewhat different to much different from that of Europe; and (3) idiolectal versus communal effects of wholesale bilingualism over large areas. The author maintains that a process similar to the creolization of a pidgin or contact language takes place in interdialectal situations involving the immigrant generation as opposed to succeeding generations. He discusses the use of theory oriented (rather than data oriented) elicitation procedures and questionnaires for both phonology and syntax in the light of recent theories of rule reordering and rule additions in areal linguistics. (Author/DO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED037723

Linguistic Change in the Colonial and Immigrant Languages in the United States[1]

Glenn G. Gilbert
Southern Illinois University
(manuscript submitted
April 20, 1970)

The non-English European languages still spoken in the United States have, as a rule, undergone rapid and far-reaching linguistic change. Of greatest interest are the languages which were introduced into rural enclaves by immigrants in the seventeenth through early twentieth centuries and which are now spoken by native-born Americans of native-born parentage. The enclaves formed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries ~~may be~~ are called primary; those formed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are secondary. The largest primary enclaves are made up of Spanish speakers in New Mexico and Colorado, French speakers in Louisiana and Texas, and German speakers in Pennsylvania. Secondary enclaves include the French Canadians of the northeast, the Mexicans of the southwest, and the Germans, Czechs, and Norwegians of the midwest and Texas. These languages, and perhaps a few others such as Dutch, Swedish, and Danish in the midwest, are spoken in sufficiently large, cohesive tracts of territory to justify the use of the traditional European techniques of ~~topographical~~ linguistic mapping ~~of linguistic forms~~ as a ~~valuable~~ prime source of data in the testing

AL 002 351

of linguistic theories.

Up to now, there hardly exists what could be called an established linguistic geography of languages other than English in the United States. Our knowledge of the primary enclaves, where immigration was essentially completed by the beginning of the nineteenth century, is sketchy at best; the situation is still less favorable for the secondary enclaves, where members of the first generation born in the United States and even the immigrants themselves could still be interviewed, if anyone cared to do so. There are linguistic atlases, as such, only of German in southeastern Pennsylvania (Reed and Seifert 1954, forthcoming) and in central Texas (Gilbert, forthcoming). The primary Spanish enclave in New Mexico and Colorado has been essentially ignored since Aurelio M. Espinosa's outstanding descriptive study early in this century (Espinosa 1909-1914). Although considerably more effort has been devoted to the primary French enclave in Louisiana, most investigators seem to shrink back from areal studies, chiefly because of the large number of "free variants" which abound in the grammars of the speakers. Von Wartburg (1942) was so impressed by what he called the "instab...ty" of the language that he advised the abandonment of all plans for the preparation of a linguistic atlas. On the other hand, such excellent studies as those of Conwell and Juilland (1963) and ~~Morgan (1959, 1960)~~ Guilbeau (1950) succeed in ~~giving~~ producing giving a systematic account of evidence gathered from entire parishes. These could

undoubtedly be expanded into a full-scale atlas if such an undertaking ~~could be~~ were materially justified in view of its expected scientific returns.

The terms "colonial languages" and "immigrant languages" were first introduced by Haugen (1956). In general, this distinction has the effect of dividing Spanish and French, in so far as they were introduced by their respective colonial powers, from all other non-English European languages brought to the Thirteen Colonies or to the ~~xxxxx~~ United States. Priority of settlement seems to be the most decisive factor affecting the longevity or survival potential of all of these languages (Kloss 1963; Gilbert 1969:221). Generally, their most prominent characteristics are: 1) rapid linguistic change, beginning with the emigrating generation; 2) a combination of archaism and innovation, which differentiates them from their Old World counterparts; 3) widespread bilingualism in the mother tongue and in English.

One of their chief attractions has been in the fact that the great majority of speakers are fluent in two (or more) languages, with all that this implies (Haugen 1956, forthcoming). They have been of still greater interest to linguists for purposes of comparison with/~~xxxx~~ varieties of the language still spoken in Europe (e.g., Hedblom 1969). ~~Here, however,~~ let us now consider a ~~somewhat different~~ third type of problem, namely, what kinds of information about them will be of value in evaluating current linguistic theory and how may such information be

obtained. In this context the term "linguistic theory" will be restricted primarily to diachronic linguistics as viewed by generative grammarians (e.g., King 1969) and as extended by recent suggestions of Labov (1969).

Disregarding the complications introduced by the effects of bilingualism, it is important to ask: what are the changes in the grammar of the immigrants which enable the speakers of various dialects of a single language -- dialects which were often mutually unintelligible in Europe -- to make themselves understood in the new situation? Is it a matter of being forced to learn the complete grammar of a "new language" or only of making relatively minor additions to the grammar which the speakers already possess?

For the purposes of the following discussion, let us set up a generational model in which 0 represents the emigrating generation, 1 the first to be born in the United States, 2 the second to be born in the United States, and so on (figure 1).

Figure 1. Generational Model of Immigration to the United States

emigrated to the U.S.	gen. 0
born in the U.S.	gen. 1
born in the U.S. ("natives-of-natives")	gen. 2
etc.	

Unless unusual circumstances intervene, those members of generation 0 who settle in urban or rural areas where different dialects of their language are spoken are ultimately faced with the choice of switching to English when dealing with speakers of other dialects or of finding some kind of linguistic accomodation with them. If they choose to accomodate (and this is often a conscious choice), it is clear that various rules in their grammars will have to be optionally added or deleted (but probably never reordered). At first, such rule changes are triggered by interlocutory constraints or Partnerzwang. Later, they may become characteristic of geographical location, social structure, linguistic style, or may simply be called "free variation." Even if the presence or absence of a specific change shows no correlation with (or conditioning by) non-linguistic factors, it should still be possible to incorporate it in a meaningful way into a performance model containing an adequate generative grammar by notations of its frequency of occurrence. Such frequency rules, or variable rules as Labov (1969:728 ff.) calls them, are stated in terms of the percentage of actual occurrences within the total number of potential occurrences, for a specified corpus and under explicit extra-linguistic conditions. ~~Such~~ This precision is of great value in the study of rapid linguistic change, since the variations often serve as indicators of the type and direction of the change. Note, though, that frequency analysis deserves much careful study because of its implications for linguistic theory in general.

Figure 2. Schematic Diagram of Rule Changes by Generation
(effects of bilingualism with English disregarded here)

Extra-Linguistic Events	Rule Changes	Generation No.
village life in Europe; relatively little social and geographical mobility	ratio of variable to categorical rules relatively small	- 1
emigration from Europe to the United States within the lifetime of this generation	many variable rules in the grammar introduced due to emigration and attendant social upheaval: determined by interlocutor, later by style, social stratification, etc., or by "free variation"	0
born in the United States	a part of the variable rules of generation 0 becomes categorical; others remain variable [A]	1
born in the United States	ratio of variable to categorical rules decreases	2
born in the United States	ratio of variable to categorical rules continues to decrease, but is still not as small as in generation -1; etc.	3

A) This parallels the explanation in terms of "primary features (categorical rule changes) and "secondary features" (variable rule changes) advanced by the Russian linguist, Victor Zhirmunsky, more than forty years ago (Zhirmunsky 1928-1929).

Now, within generation 0, who accomodates to whom? In other words, if two dialects, A and B, come into contact, what sociolinguistic criteria are relevant for predicting which of the two dialect grammars will undergo the most change? Aside from considerations of internal structure, the most important single factor seems to be dialect prestige, which in turn is chiefly dependent upon the similarity or dissimilarity of the grammar of a given dialect to that of the standard language. If the grammar of dialect A is markedly more similar to the standard than is B, A will acquire prestige and be imitated, even if its speakers are in the minority. Indirectly and directly, the standard language acts as a powerful model for the direction of change, bringing about what could be called a "colonial standardization effect." Other important sociolinguistic factors influencing the direction of accomodation are literacy in the standard language, relative numbers and locations of speakers, priority of settlement, marriage patterns, and religion.

Because of these processes, the ratio of variable to categorical rules will be considerably higher for speakers of generation 0 than for speakers of preceding generations. In addition, there is evidence that many of the variable rules revert to categorical status for speakers of generations 1, 2, and following, so that the ratio again declines. (see Figure 2).

How are we to ~~conceive~~ think of these changes? Are they the product of a gradual, incremental process extending over many generations? Or does there occur an abrupt restructuring involving rule reordering

and grammar simplification, as well as rule addition and deletion? Postal (1968:286-307), King (1969:106-119), and other recent writers on the subject have presented evidence in favor of the idea of non-gradual change (in all components of the grammar), and the data from the colonial and immigrant languages seems to support this view, although much more work is needed.[2] The childhood grammar for speakers in generation 1 can only be formed on the basis of what they hear; and since the input for them is considerably different than it was for speakers of generation 0, the internalized grammars of 1 and 0 must vary greatly. Communication between the generations proceeds relatively unhindered since what is obligatory for generation 1 is optional for generation 0. This gives rise to the common observation by laymen and specialists alike, that the speech of generation 0 is somehow fundamentally different from that of 1, 2, and following. Speakers in generation 0, because of their options, seem to have one foot in the old and one in the new, whereas for their children and grandchildren, many of these options no longer exist.

In view of what has been postulated here, it is clear that the approach used by sociolinguists (social variation of language) and linguistic geographers (geographic variation of language) is well suited to gather the crucial evidence which bears on the mechanisms of change. Studies of English from ~~this~~ a similar point of view have been made by Labov (1963, 1966, 1969), Loflin (1969), Keyser (1963),

DeCamp (1962), Kiparsky (1968), and others. Becker (1967) has written on three continental German dialects from the standpoint of generative phonology. King (1969) has supplied much pertinent data inasmuch as he regards the problems of contemporary dialectology to be parallel to those of language change in general. #Of special interest is the study by Pulte (forthcoming) of underlying /y/ and /ø/ in the German dialect spoken at Dayton, Rockingham County, Virginia. Pulte found that /y/ and /ø/ are not categorically subject to the low-level phonological rule,

$$\begin{bmatrix} +\text{syllabic} \\ -\text{consonantal} \\ -\text{back} \\ -\text{low} \\ +\text{round} \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow [-\text{round}] \quad ,[3]$$

which is usually present in Pennsylvania German and in its secondary settlement areas in Maryland, Virginia, and elsewhere (Reed and Seifert 1954, forthcoming; Buffington and Barba 1954). Since Dayton was originally populated by German speakers from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (which today shows only unrounding), it seems likely that the unrounding rule was once variable in Pennsylvania German.[4] Independent evidence (Pulte, forthcoming) suggests that unrounding had become obligatory for almost all Pennsylvania German speakers by 1850 at the latest. The settlement at Dayton, Virginia, however, had been established some seventy-five years earlier; in its subsequent linguistic isolation it apparently escaped this particular phonological innovation. Among the three generations of speakers

which Pulte studied, the rule seems to be variable (or does not apply?) for the oldest generation and is categorical for the youngest generation. Furthermore, his data point to an abrupt change, thus lending support to the general position of Postal and K[illegible]g.

The generative approach to linguistic change in "transplanted" languages raises many problems concerning the nature of the absolute and relative alterations of rules which make up the various interacting, often closely related, dialect grammars. We are left with such unresolved questions as: does the grammar of adults change in a more superficial way (i.e., at a lower level) than that of children? Are rule addition and deletion more common than rule reordering and grammar simplification? Are high-level rules generally immune to change? Are the phrase structure rules in the base ever changed? What is the relationship between the order of the rules in a synchronic grammar and their historical ordering? And so on.

No matter how elaborate a linguistic questionnaire may be, it still remains subject to the limitations of the theory upon which it is based. Since, for example, Kurath and McDavid's voluminous study of English pronunciation in the Atlantic states (Kurath and McDavid 1961) is couched in terms of autonomous phonemes, many questions about systematic phonemic structure and rule ordering remain unanswered, as Keyser (1963) has pointed out. If it is

suspected, as some evidence indicates, that rules become more general as they spread out from a focal point and encompass increasingly large tracts of territory,[5] questions must be devised to test specifically for this phenomenon. A simple accumulation of data, no matter how elaborate, is not sufficient; an explicit theory of language must stand behind the plan and execution of field work so that the attention of the investigator may be directed toward certain crucial cases. Numerous grammatical and ungrammatical examples should be elicited and arranged in revealing arrays (Loflin 1969) to provide empirical data bearing on the claims or theories to be tested.

One of our chief concerns should be with underlying representations. It is desirable to find some way to structure linguistic interviews so as to maximize the value of the responses in revealing underlying forms. For the phonological component, this could mean, for example, a sequence of questions designed firstly to elicit paradigmatic alternations and secondly syntagmatic alternations, with a view toward the relationships of the surface structure to the underlying morphophonemic representations. For the syntactic component, we might want to include questions bearing directly on certain key transformations such as equi-noun deletion, negation, interrogation, relativization, and case. Very important are apparent or real violations of the phonological and syntactic constraints which are thought to form a part of universal grammar,

e.g., the presence of four or more tongue heights for non-back vowels, or word orders not listed among Greenberg's universals (Greenberg 1966), and the like.

It should be evident that the conceptual framework of transformational-generative grammar (Chomsky 1965; Chomsky and Halle 1968; etc.) has much to offer in the formulation of research methods concerning geographical and social variation in language. In return, the colonial and immigrant languages spoken in our midst can and will ~~provide~~ yield much data on crucial questions of linguistics, if only the investigators knew what was needed.

FOOTNOTES

1. A preliminary version of this paper was read at the December 1969 meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in San Francisco.

2. A recent statement of the "gradualist hypothesis" can be found in Hockett (1958:439-445). King expressly states that he is not denying that changes may spread gradually throughout a speech community; it is only the implementation of the change in the grammar of each speaker which is abrupt (King 1969:117). Although his discussion only deals with phonology, he posits the same process for the syntactic and semantic components (personal communication).

3. i.e., underlying non-back, non-low, rounded vowels become unround. The process of Entrundung is characteristic of a great number of German dialects as well as of central and southern varieties of colloquial German.

4. This could be confirmed independently if it were shown that a significant proportion of the immigrants of generation 0 in Lancaster County came from dialectal areas in Europe which lacked the unrounding rule, as for example Switzerland. Carroll E. Reed, on the other hand, believes that unrounding has been an obligatory rule in Pennsylvania German from the earliest times (personal communication).

5. A classic example is the process that operated in Germany from approximately 600 to 1000 AD. which converted tense, non-continuant, non-strident segments into their strident, non-continuant or continuant counterparts; and lax, non-continuant, non-strident segments into their tense counterparts (hochdeutsche Lautverschiebung). Contrary to prevailing opinion, Schützeichel (1961, 1964, etc.) has suggested that the new rules arose in Franconian territory in west-central Germany and spread to the south. "Angesichts der 'viel größeren Bedeutung und Macht der Franken' nimmt Schützeichel an, daß der Anstoß zur Lautverschiebung den südlichen Völkerschaften nur von den Franken her übermittelt sein könne. (Er nimmt also eine nord → südliche Entwicklung an im Gegensatz zu Frings, der sich die II Lautverschiebung in umgekehrter Richtung im deutschen Raum vollziehen läßt.) Im Süden habe sie sich (so meint Schützeichel) entsprechend den artikulatorischen Anlagen und Gewohnheiten der dortigen Stämme nur kräftiger entwickelt." (Bach 1965:111). Unfortunately, the hypothesis of generative grammarians that rules are borrowed (i.e., "spread") "with the same or greater generality, but not with lessened generality" (King 1969:90 ff.) cannot help us directly in this important case, since we would then fall into the logical pitfall of allowing the two hypotheses to demonstrate each other's validity. More evidence from other, clear-cut cases with independent historical confirmation is needed.

REFERENCES

Bach, Adolf. 1965. Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache. 8th edition. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer.

Becker, Donald Allen. 1967. Generative Phonology and Dialect Study: An Investigation of Three Modern German Dialects. Austin: Unpublished University of Texas Dissertation.

Buffington, Albert F., and Preston A. Barba. 1954. A Pennsylvania German Grammar. Allentown, Penn.: Schlechter.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Chomsky, Noam, and Morris Halle. 1968. The Sound Pattern of English. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row.

Conwell, Marilyn J., and Alphonse Juilland. 1963. Louisiana French Grammar. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

DeCamp, David. 1962. Creole Language Areas Considered As Multilingual Communities. Symposium on Multilingualism, 227-231. Lagos, Nairobi, London: Commission de Coopération Technique en Afrique.

Espinosa, Aurelio M. 1909-1914. Studies in New Mexican Spanish. Part I: Phonology. Revue de Dialectologie Romane 1.157-239, 269-300 (1909). Part II: Morphology. ~~Romanische~~ 3.241-256 (1911); 4.251-286 (1912); 5.142-172 (1913). Part III: The English Elements. 6.241-317 (1914). [This was translated into Spanish, revised, and annotated by Amado Alonso and Ángel Rosenblat, in Estudios sobre el Español de Nuevo Méjico (Part I. Fonética. Buenos Aires: Univ. of Buenos Aires Press. 1930); and by Ángel Rosenblat (Part II. Morfología. 1946). Regarding Part III, Rosenblat (1946:4) states: "La Parte III, dedicada a 'Los elementos ingleses', aparecerá más adelante, rehecha enteramente por el autor, en volumen aparte de nuestra Biblioteca." This work was apparently never completed.]

Gilbert, Glenn G. 1969. Review of Das Nationalitätenrecht der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, by Heinz Kloss. Language 45.218-224.

Gilbert, Glenn G. forthcoming. Linguistic Atlas of Texas German. Marburg: Elwert Verlag; and Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Guilbeau, John. 1950. The French Spoken in Lafourche Parish, Louisiana. Chapel Hill: Unpublished University of North Carolina Dissertation.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. Universals of Language, 2nd ed., ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, 73-113. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Haugen, Einar. 1956. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. (= Publication of the American Dialect Society, No. 26). University, Alabama.

Haugen, Einar. forthcoming. Bilingualism, Language Contact, and Immigrant Languages in the United States: A Research Report 1956-1970. To appear in: Current Trends in Linguistics, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, vol. 10. The Hague: Mouton.

Hedblom, Folke. 1969. Svenska Folkmål i Nya Världen: Från 1960-talets Fältundersökningar i Amerika. Saga och Sed 1968, 38-49.

Hockett, Charles F. 1958. A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan.

Keyser, Samuel Jay. 1963. Review of The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States, by Hans Kurath and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Language 39.303-316.

King, Robert D. 1969. Historical Linguistics and Generative Grammar. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1968. Linguistic Universals and Linguistic Change. Universals in Linguistic Theory, ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms, 170-202. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kloss, Heinz. 1963. Das Nationalitätenrecht der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. Vienna and Stuttgart: Wilhelm Braumüller Verlag. [This is scheduled to appear in the fall of 1970 in an English translation: The Bilingual Tradition in the United States. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. Pages 307-327 were reprinted

in Joshua A. Fishman, ed. Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague: Mouton (1968), but were unfortunately not translated.]

Kurath, Hans, and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. 1961. The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Univ. of Michigan Press.

Labov, William. 1963. The Social Motivation of a Sound Change. Word 19.273-309.

Labov, William. 1966. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, William. 1969. Contraction, Deletion, and Inherent Variability of the English Copula. Language 45.715-762.

Loflin, Marvin D. 1969. Negro Nonstandard and Standard English: Same Or Deep Structure. Orbis 18.74-91.

~~Morgan, Raleigh, Jr. 1959. Structural Sketch of St. Martin Creole. Anthropological Linguistics 1.20-25 (Nov. 1959)~~

~~Morgan, Raleigh, Jr. 1960. The Lexicon of St. Martin Creole. Anthropological Linguistics 2.7-29. (Jan. 1960)~~

Postal, Paul M. 1968. Aspects of Phonological Theory. New York: Harper & Row.

Pulte, William, Jr. forthcoming. The German Language in Virginia and West Virginia. To appear in: The German Language in America, ed. Glenn G. Gilbert.

Reed, Carroll E., and Lester W. J. Seifert. 1954. Linguistic Atlas of Pennsylvania German. Marburg: private edition.

Reed, Carroll E., and Lester W. J. Seifert. forthcoming. Word Atlas of Pennsylvania German. Marburg: Elwert Verlag.

Schützeichel, Rudolf . 1961. Die Grundlagen des westlichen Mitteldeutschen. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

Schützeichel, Rudolf . 1964. Neue Funde zur Lautverschiebung im Mittelfränkischen. Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum 93.19-30.

von Wartburg, Walther. 1942. To What Extent Is an Atlas of Louisiana French Possible or Desirable. Bulletin of the American Council of Learned Societies 34.76-81.

Zhirmunsky, Victor (Viktor Schirmunski). 1928-1929. Die Schwäbischen Mundarten in Transkaukasien und Südukraine. Teuthonista 5.38-60, 157-171.